

Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00020 01 OF 02 021458Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07

/097 W

----- 010092

R 021346Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1396

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0020

FROM US REP MBFR

LO. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PARM NATO

SUBJ: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DABROWA JAN 30 PRESS CONFERENCE
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

REF: MBFR VIENNA 0015

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: DABROWA'S ANSWERS IN HIS JAN 30 PRESS
CONFERENCE (VIENNA MBFR 0015) ESSENTIALLY REFLECTED THE LINE
TAKEN IN HIS PLENARY PRESENTATION AND FORMAL PRESS STATEMENT.
HE MADE AN EFFORT TO SUBORDINATE THE WESTERN NUCLEAR PROPOSAL
TO OTHER PROPOSALS CURRENTLY ON THE NEGOTIATING TABLE AND
SUGGESTED THAT ANY PROPOSAL BEFORE THE DELEGATES CAN STILL
BE "AMPLIFIED, OR EVEN CHANGED." ASKED WHETHER THE EAST WILL
PRESENT NEW PROPOSALS, DABROWA SKIRTED THE ISSUE BY SAYING
THAT IT WAS NOT HIS INTENTION TO PRESENT A NEW PROPOSAL "AT
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00020 01 OF 02 021458Z

THIS MEETING." THE RATHER EXTENSIVE ATTENTION PAID TO FORCE

DEFINITIONS IN HIS RESPONSES SUGGESTS THAT THE EASTERN SIDE MAY WANT TO GIVE THAT TOPIC A PREEMINENT PLACE, DURING THE COMING NEGOTIATING ROUND. END SUMMARY.

BEGIN UNCLASSIFIED

BEGIN TEXT:

1. Q. (CBS) IN SUMMING UP YOUR STATEMENT, IS THIS AN OUTRIGHT REJECTION OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL, OR DO YOU THINK THERE ARE SOME POINTS WHICH CAN LEAD TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DISCUSSIONS?

A. AS FAR AS THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DECEMBER 16, 1975, IS CONCERNED, THE DELEGATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST STATES, AS IS KNOWN, HAVE ALREADY EXPRESSED A NUMBER OF CRITICAL COMMENTS ON THAT SUBJECT. THIS PROPOSAL DOES NOT CHANGE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE WHOLE POSITION OF THE NATO STATES. IT HAS BEEN MADE DEPENDENT UPON THE ACCEPTANCE BY THE SOCIALIST STATES OF THE WHOLE WESTERN SCHEME OF REDUCTIONS. MORE THAN ONCE WE HAD EXPLAINED THAT FOR ALL THESE REASONS THIS SCHEME IS NOT ACCEPTABLE FOR US. FOR INSTANCE, AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THIS SCHEME, THE NEW PROPOSAL ENVISAGES THE REDUCTION OF A CERTAIN PART OF THE AMERICAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS. IT DOES NOT COVER THE MEANS OF DELIVERY OWNED BY OTHER NATO STATES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. I WISH TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE SOCIALIST STATES, FROM THE VERY BEGINNING, HAVE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF ALL KINDS OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN THE AREA, INCLUDING NUCLEAR ARMS. FROM THIS STANDPOINT WE TREAT THE PROPOSAL OF THE 16TH DECEMBER, 1975, AS A MOVE WHICH MEANS AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE NECESSITY TO INCLUDE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE REDUCTION PROCESS. AT THE SAME TIME, WE CANNOT FAIL TO OBSERVE THAT THIS STEP IS INSUFFICIENT. OBVIOUSLY, THIS PROPOSAL WILL BE DISCUSSED ALONG WITH OTHER PROPOSALS MADE BY THE PARTICIPANTS.

2. Q. (REUTERS) MR AMBASSADOR, CAN YOU TELL US WHETHER THE REMARKS YOU HAVE JUST MADE ARE BROADLY SPEAKING WHAT WAS CONTAINED IN YOUR PLENARY PRESENTATION OF TODAY? IS THAT WHAT IN FACT YOU TOLD THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS? AND, ALSO, HAVE YOU OFFERED - OR ARE YOU CONTEMPLATING OFFERING - A FURTHER LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00020 01 OF 02 021458Z

PROPOSAL FROM YOUR SIDE?

A. WE ARE OF COURSE GUIDED BY THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE TALKS AND I CANNOT DISCLOSE DETAILS OF MY STATEMENT. THE GENERAL LINE OF MY STATEMENT WAS MORE OR LESS SIMILAR TO THE GENERAL LINE OF MY STATEMENT TO THE PRESS. BUT EACH ELEMENT OF MY STATEMENT TO THE PRESS WAS MORE ELABORATED AT THE PLENARY MEETING THAN IT WAS HERE. THAT CONCERNS ALSO THE APPRAISAL

OF THE LATEST WESTERN PROPOSAL.

(SUPPLEMENTARY- COULD I ASK AGAIN ABOUT THE LAST PART OF MY QUESTION, WHETHER YOU PRESENTED, OR ARE CONSIDERING PRESENTING, FURTHER PROPOSALS FROM YOUR SIDE?) DURING TODAY'S MEETING, IN MY STATEMENT I RESTATED THE GENERAL POSITION OF THE SOCIALIST STATES, AND IT WAS NOT MY INTENTION TO PRESENT ANY NEW SUBSTANTIAL IDEA AT THIS MEETING IN THE CONTEXT OF A NEW PROPOSAL.

3.Q. (BBC) YOU SAY, MR AMBASSADOR, THAT YOU HOPE THAT THERE WILL BE AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE MATTER OF NOMENCLATURE DURING THE PRESENT ROUND. COULD YOU EXPLAIN IN A LITTLE MORE DETAIL WHY IT IS THAT THE WARSAW PACT ATTACHES SUCH ATTENTION TO THIS QUESTION THAT YOU MENTION AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 3 OF YOUR STATEMENT, DEFINING GROUND AND AIR FORCES?

A. WELL, I HOPE THAT NOT ONLY THE WARSAW PACT STATES ATTACH IMPORTANCE TO THIS MATTER. OBVIOUSLY, ALL PARTICIPANTS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD ATTACH IMPORTANCE TO THAT MATTER. IT IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE WE ARE DISCUSSING HERE THE QUESTION OF REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. OF COURSE IT IS CLEAR THAT IN DIFFERENT PARTICIPATING STATES THE ORGANIZATION, THE STRUCTURE OF ARMED FORCES IS DIFFERENT. EVEN THE NOMENCLATURE IS DIFFERENT. THE SAME TYPES OF UNITS OR EQUIPMENT IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES BELONG TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF FORCES. THAT SITUATION DOES NOT FACILITATE OUR DISCUSSION ON THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS. WHEN INTRODUCING THE IDEA OF A CLASSIFICATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN TH E AREA, WE HAVE IN MIND TO GOVE A MORE ACCURATE PICTURE, OR RATHER TO HAVE FOR OURSELVES A MORE ACCURATE PICTURE OF THE SITUATION IN THIS MATTER. SINCE, AS YO KNOW, THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES ARE IN FAVOR OF INCLUDING ALL KINDS OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS INTO THE REDUCTION, WE CONSIDER LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00020 01 OF 02 021458Z

IT USEFUL TO EXPRESS OUR OPINION ON THIS, AND ALSO TO LISTEN TO THE OPINION AND VIEWS OF OTHER DELEGATIONS, PARTICULARLY WESTERN DELEGATIONS, WHICH KINDS OF FORCES FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS DO THEY COUNT OR INCLUDE INTO AIR FORCES OR GROUND FORCES. I SUPPOSE YOU KNOW THE POSITION OF THE SOCIALIST STATES IN THIS MATTER; WE ARE FOR THE INCLUSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE NEGOTIATION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS OF THE SAME KIND INTO THE SAME CATEGORIES OF FORCES.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00020 02 OF 02 021519Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07

/097 W

----- 010399

R 021346Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1397

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0020

FROM US REP MBFR

4. Q. MAY I JUST ASK ANOTHER QUESTION: DON'T YOU THINK IT WOULD BE ALSO USEFUL TO REPLY TO THE DETAILED INFORMATION WHICH THE WEST HAS ALREADY PROVIDED ON NUMBERS OF FORCES, SO THAT THE NATO COULD ALSO HAVE A CLEARER IDEA OF WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT?

A. OF COURSE YOU KNOW THAT THE QUESTION OF THE DATA IS NOT A NEW ONE, AND THAT THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS PROPOSE THE EXCHANGE OF DATA. AT THIS STAGE THEY EVEN PROPOSE TO DO THAT AT AN EARLY STAGE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE POSITION OF THE SOCIALIST STATES REMAINS UNCHANGED AT THIS MOMENT. IN OUR OPINION THE EXCHANGE OF DATA - THE QUESTION OF THE EXCHANGE OF DATA - WOULD BE MORE TOPICAL ONCE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00020 02 OF 02 021519Z

THE PRINCIPLES OF A GENERAL LINE OF AN AGREEMENT

ON REDUCTION ARE AGREED ON.

5. Q. (CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR) WOULD YOU NOT AGREE THAT WHAT YOU DESCRIBE DATA, NUMERICAL DATA, IS ONE OF THE ESSENTIALS CLOSELY RELATED TO THE DEFINITIONS THAT YOU ARE NOW PROPOSING? THAT EACH SIDE HAS AN IDEA HOW MANY SOLDIERS, HOW MANY TANKS, HOW MANY AIRCRAFT ARE INVOLVED?

A. THE DISCUSSIONS HELD SO FAR ON THE QUESTION OF DEFINITION OR CLASSIFICATION PROVED THAT IT IS QUITE POSSIBLE TO DISCUSS THAT MATTER BEFORE THE EXCHANGE OF DATA.

6. Q. (APA) HOW DO YOU ENVISAGE THE CONTINUATION OF THE TALKS? THE WEST SAYS, AS YOU PUT IN YOUR STATEMENT, THAT THE LAST PROPOSAL IS TO BE TAKEN AS EITHER TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT. HOW CAN YOU GO ON WITH TALKS ABOUT THAT PROPOSAL?

A. THIS PROPOSAL IS JUST ONE OF THE PROPOSALS THAT ARE ON THE NEGOTIATING TABLE. IN THE PROCESS OF DISCUSSION, THE DELEGATIONS EXPLAIN THEIR PROPOSALS IN MORE DETAIL; SOMETIME THEY DEVELOP THEIR PROPOSALS, SOMETIME THEY CHANGE THEIR PROPOSALS. AND AS I SAID IN MY STATEMENT, WE TREAT THE LAST WESTERN PROPOSAL JUST LIKE ANY OTHER PROPOSALS TABLED SO FAR BY THE DELEGATIONS.

8. Q. (CBS) IS THE CURBING OF THE SIZE OF THE WEST GERMAN ARMY ONE OF THE STUMBLING BLOCKS IN THESE DISCUSSIONS?

A. THE SOCIALIST DELEGATION ARE IN FAVOR OF THE INCLUSION OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS OF REDUCTION. AMONG THESE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS THERE ARE A NUMBER OF STATES WHICH SO FAR DID NOT DECLARE THEIR READINESS TO UNDERTAKE ANY OBLIGATIONS ON REDUCTION. THE FRG BELONGS TO THAT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00020 02 OF 02 021519Z

CATEGORY. WE CONSIDER THAT THE LACK OF CONSENT BY WESTERN EUROPEAN STATES AND CANADA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROCESS OF REDUCTION IS ONE OF THE MAIN OBSTACLES ON THE WAY TO PROGRESS.

8. Q. COULD YOU EXPLAIN THE SENTENCE IN YOUR STATEMENT THAT, AND I QUOTE, "EACH OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS MUST UNEQUIVOCALLY SPECIFY WHAT, WHEN AND HOW IT

WILL REDUCE." COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHETHER THIS IS A COMMENT DIFFERENT FROM WHAT ALL THE PARTICIPANTS AGREED UPON OR IS IT A PRINCIPLE OF THE SOCIALIST STATES ALONE?

A. IN MY VIEW THE SOCIALIST STATES DID NOT INVENT ANY PRINCIPLE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS OF THEIR OWN. OUR POSITION IS FULLY BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES AGREED DURING THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS. THE MUTUALITY, THE RECIPROCITY OF THE REDUCTION OBLIGATIONS IS ONE OF THOSE AGREED PRINCIPLES. THAT IS WHY WE CONSIDER IT SO IMPORTANT THAT EACH PARTICIPANT, BEFORE ENTERING INTO OBLIGATIONS, BEFORE SIGNING ANY AGREEMENT, KNOWS WHAT KIND OF OBLIGATION ALL OTHER PARTICIPANTS ARE READY TO UNDERTAKE.

9. Q. (BBC) COULD I RETURN TO THE QUESTION OF SERIOUS CONCERN ABOUT THE STRIVING OF CERTAIN WESTERN STATES TO EXPAND THEIR FORCES. AT THE SAME TIME IN THE WEST FAIRLY RECENTLY THERE HAVE BEEN EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN - IN AMERICA, IN BRITAIN, IN WESTERN GERMANY - ABOUT THE STEADY BUILD-UP OF WARSAW PAV FORCES. SO BOTH SIDES SEEM TO BE LACKING CONFIDENCE. DO YOU THINK THAT IN THIS SITUATION IT IS REALLY POSSIBLE FOR YOU TO MAKE ANY PROGRESS HERE IN VIENNA?

Q. OUR AIM AT THESE NEGOTIATIONS IS EXACTLY TO LIMIT THE GROWTH OF MILITARY FORCES OF EACH PARTICIPATING STATE. WE ARE NOT PROPOSING - THE SOCIALIST STATES ARE NOT PROPOSING - ANY OBLIGATION TO THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS THAT THEY THEMSELVES ARE NOT READY TO LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00020 02 OF 02 021519Z

UNDERTAKE. AN IF WE WOULD NOT BE OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THESE TALKS I DONJT THINK WE WOULD BE SITTING HERE IN VIENNA.

END TEXT. END UNCLASSIFIED.RESOR

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: PRESS CONFERENCES, BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEPLOYMENT
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 02 FEB 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: morefirh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00020
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760038-1029
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760292/aaaadcra.tel
Line Count: 321
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 MBFR VIENNA 15
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: morefirh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 OCT 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20 OCT 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <19 MAY 2004 by morefirh>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DABROWA JAN 30 PRESS CONFERENCE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
TAGS: PARM, US, XG, NATO, WTO, MBFR, (DABROWA)
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006